

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,430	01/31/2002	Dah Ming Chiu	SMY-261.01	5098
45774	7590 06/01/2006		EXAMINER	
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP			SHAND, ROBERTA A	
ONE STATE STREET, SUITE 800 BOSTON, MA 02109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
202101,			2616	
			DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	P
Office Action Summary		10/066,430	CHIU ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Roberta A. Shand	2616	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the common state of the common s	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communicatio ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•		
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 M.</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	•	s
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 13-16</u> is/are reject Claim(s) <u>3,5,6,9,11 and 12</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Applicati	ón Papers			
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) <u> </u>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		·

Application/Control Number: 10/066,430 Page 2

Art Unit: 2616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blouin (U.S. .2003/0126246 A1) in view of Nikolich (U.S. 6826195 B1).
- 4. Regarding claim 1, Blouin teaches a method for selecting routing information to be provided to devices in a communication network, comprising: obtaining routing information describing a plurality of routes between forwarding devices of said communication network from a single routing table (fig. 4 and paragraph 69), wherein said plurality of alternative routes is deadlock free (Blouin teaches that the routes are listed according to performance metric and the best route is listed first is the best route and highest ranked and the others in the list are

Art Unit: 2616

alternatives and each ranked lower than the previous going down the list); selecting a final enabled routing from said plurality of alternative routes, wherein said selecting optimizes a performance metric (paragraph 14).

- 5. Blouin does not teach delivering a forwarding table to each forwarding device in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing.
- 6. Nikolich teaches (col. 7, lines 46-56) delivering (broadcasting) a forwarding table to each forwarding device (application modules) in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing. It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt this to Blouin's system to increase quality of service within the system
- Regarding claims 2 and 8, Blouin teaches (paragraph 69) performance metric is network capacity.
- 8. Regarding claims 4 and 10, Blouin teaches (paragraph 69) performance metric is fault tolerance.
- 9. Regarding claim 7, Blouin teaches a system for selecting routing information to be provided to devices in a communication network, comprising routing logic operable to: obtain routing information describing a plurality of alternative routes between forwarding devices of said communication network (paragraph 69), wherein said plurality of routes is deadlock free

Art Unit: 2616

(Blouin teaches that the routes are listed according to performance metric and the best route is listed first is the best route and highest ranked and the others in the list are alternatives and each ranked lower than the previous going down the list); select a final enabled routing from said plurality of alternative routes, wherein said selecting optimizes a performance metric (paragraph 14).

- Blouin does not teach delivering a forwarding table to each forwarding device in said 10. communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing.
- Nikolich teaches (col. 7, lines 46-56) delivering (broadcasting) a forwarding table to each 11. forwarding device (application modules) in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing. It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt this to Blouin's system to increase quality of service within the system
- 12. Regarding claim 13, it is inherent in Blouin's system that routing logic comprises at least one digital logic circuit in that this system is a signal processing system.
- 13. Regarding claim 14, Blouin teaches (fig. 1) routing logic comprises program code loaded into a memory of a computer system.
- 14. Regarding claim 15, a system for selecting routing information to be provided to devices in a communication network, comprising: means for obtaining routing information describing a

Art Unit: 2616

plurality of alternative routes between forwarding devices of said communication network from a single routing table (fig. 4 and paragraph 69), wherein said plurality of routes is deadlock free (Blouin teaches that the routes are listed according to performance metric and the best route is listed first is the best route and highest ranked and the others in the list are alternatives and each ranked lower than the previous going down the list); means for selecting a final enabled routing from said plurality of alternative routes, wherein said selecting optimizes a performance metric (paragraph 14).

- 15. Blouin does not teach delivering a forwarding table to each forwarding device in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing.
- Nikolich teaches (col. 7, lines 46-56) delivering (broadcasting) a forwarding table to each forwarding device (application modules) in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing. It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt this to Blouin's system to increase quality of service within the system
- 17. Regarding claim 16, Blouin teaches a computer program product including a computer readable medium, said computer readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, said computer program for selecting routing information for distribution to at least one networking device, said computer program comprising: program code for obtaining routing information describing a plurality of routes between forwarding devices of said communication network from a single routing table (paragraph 69), wherein said plurality of routes is deadlock

Application/Control Number: 10/066,430

Art Unit: 2616

free (Blouin teaches that the routes are listed according to performance metric and the best route is listed first is the best route and highest ranked and the others in the list are alternatives and each ranked lower than the previous going down the list); program code for selecting a final enabled routing from said plurality of alternative routes, wherein said selecting optimizes a performance metric (paragraph 14).

- 18. Blouin does not teach delivering a forwarding table to each forwarding device in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing.
- 19. Nikolich teaches (col. 7, lines 46-56) delivering (broadcasting) a forwarding table to each forwarding device (application modules) in said communication network, the forwarding tables containing no alternative routes and causing the forwarding devices to implement the final enabled routing. It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt this to Blouin's system to increase quality of service within the system

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/066,430

Art Unit: 2616

Conclusion

- 21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.
- 23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta A Shand whose telephone number is 571-272-3161. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am-5:30pm.
- 24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/066,430

Art Unit: 2616

Page 8

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberta A Shand Examiner Art Unit 2616

HUY D. VU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600